

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

Donald Needham,

Plaintiff,

v.

Butler County Jail, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00294

Judge Michael R. Barrett

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's November 2, 2020 Report and Recommendation ("R&R") that the Court grant Defendant Correctional Officer Blanton's Motion to Dismiss. (Doc. 57). Proper notice has been given to the parties, including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the R&R by November 16, 2020. (*Id.*, PageID 307); see *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). On November 16, 2020, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Notice of Stalking Order, and Slandering of Individual and thus Assets, and thus while obvious disabilities currently exists let alone in just harassment notice to the court staffing and yourselves." (Doc. 58).

With respect to dispositive matters, and when the Court receives timely objections to an R&R, the assigned "district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). "The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions." *Id.*

The Magistrate Judge provided a comprehensive review of the record in the November 2, 2020 R&R, and in prior R&Rs and Orders, and the same will not be repeated here. See (Docs. 4, 25, 35, 41, 42, 50, 54, 56, 57),

After a liberal review of Plaintiff's November 16, 2020 filing, the Court cannot discern a specific objection to the November 2, 2020 R&R. (Doc. 58); see *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (holding that the objections of a petitioner appearing pro se will be construed liberally). Plaintiff states that, on October 20, 2020, he filed "a stalking order" at the Mason Municipal Court in Mason, Ohio. (Doc. 58). He does not state who or what he filed his "stalking order" against or for. *Id.* He explains that the "stalking order" matter has been assigned to a judge on that court and then appears to suggest that this Court can contact that judge or "just wait, as there will be notice within the next 90 days." *Id.* To the extent that Plaintiff's filing can be construed as a motion for an extension of time to file objections to the November 2, 2020 R&R, the Court will deny any such request, as the Magistrate Judge previously made clear that no further extensions of time in this matter will be granted (Doc. 56), and Plaintiff does not explain why an extension of time in this matter is necessary due to, or how this case is related to, the matter in Mason Municipal Court (Doc. 58). Without more, the Court is unable to discern a specific objection to the November 2, 2020 R&R, and will accept the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition. See FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's November 2, 2020 Report and Recommendation (Doc. 57) is **ADOPTED**; Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 51) is **GRANTED**; and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. This case shall be closed and terminated from the Court's active docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_/s Michael R. Barrett\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael R. Barrett, Judge  
United States District Court